

the conditions of his confinement. So this light deal, about him being in a cell with just a single light he could not turn off, that did not even arise as a complaint until after he plea bargained, when the public relations effort began by the defense attorneys, when the public relations effort began by this, I guess, this individual's friends.

Some of the coverage I have seen, it made me think, oh, my gosh, maybe we ought to put background music on, tie a yellow ribbon around that tree. You know, one feels sorry. He has done his time. He is coming home.

Let me tell my colleagues something, this could not be the furthest from that. This man has transferred the most sensitive secrets in the history of this country. And for our national media, not all our national media, but for some of our national media to treat this as if he is the victim, as if our authority, as if our government is somehow overstepping its bounds to come down on an individual who has taken these types of secrets with the kind of evidence that we have, and obviously he has now acknowledged it, is in itself an injustice.

So it comes back to the basic question. My colleagues heard the facts tonight, the facts as given by sworn testimony, by the Director of the FBI, by Janet Reno. The evidence is hard evidence. This is not circumstantial evidence. This is not evidence that is imagined. This is evidence that, in fact, Wen Ho Lee himself admitted to some of it when he plead guilty to this felony.

Now, some people said, well, gosh, there were 59 charges. Why did they drop 58 of them? It is pretty simple why they dropped 58, because in order to pursue the 58 charges, they had to make further disclosure of national secrets.

So it was the opinion of the FBI and of the Department of Justice and the other individuals involved that it was better to get him on one charge than have to disclose any more secrets, especially since we do not know to what extent Wen Ho Lee allowed other individuals to put their hands on the material that he had taken from our secret labs.

So the question comes back, who is the victim? I hope that, after my discussion with my colleagues this evening, that on the answer to that question, this is not even considered as one of your multiple choices; that the only multiple choice you have, and you volunteer to take it, is that it was the United States of America who was the victim in this case, that it is the citizens of the United States of America who are the victims in this case, that it is the future generations of this country who have become the victim of one individual who absconded with American secrets, who, held in the highest level of trust by his fellow citizens in this country, betrayed his citi-

zens, who went in and in a methodical process transferred, first of all, changed "top secret" classification to "nonsecret" classification, and then put it out to his own computer.

This is an individual who was evasive, who did not tell the truth on occasion, who, through his attorneys, tried to mislead the FBI, who went out on his own and went into the computer and tried to cover his tracks, who on numerous occasions, as I went over, tried to get back into an area of the lab, the secure part of the lab where he knew he was denied, he was not allowed those privileges anymore. And you tell me who is the victim.

It is clear to me, and it ought to be clear to my colleagues, and I am pretty sure it is going to be clear to their constituents that the victim here is us. So keep that in mind as my colleagues hear further information on Wen Ho Lee.

In conclusion of these remarks, let me say that later this week I hope I have the opportunity to sit down with BOB BARR. I have asked BOB BARR, and BOB and I had a lengthy discussion about this, about the policies and what a U.S. attorney looks at, what kind of evidence the government looks for, and why the government, I am going to be very interested in what Mr. BARR has to say, about why the government at times is not allowed to pursue charges because they would have to reveal secrets, and the pluses and the minuses and what kind of thought process goes into that.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a responsibility of ours when we go on this recess to go out to our constituents and be fully informed on this case. This case obviously has had devastating impacts so far, and it could be much, much more severe. We need to know what we are talking about. We need to have the facts at hand.

So I think the subsequent discussions that I have with Mr. BARR on this floor will also be of some benefit to my colleagues as they go out and visit with their constituents as to what occurred and what did not occur with Wen Ho Lee at the Los Alamos labs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and October 3 on account of personal business.

Mr. HILLEARY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending a funeral.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legis-

lative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BACA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOUDER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CAMPBELL, for 5 minutes, October 3.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CANNON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SCOTT on H.R. 5284.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On September 28, 2000:

H.J. Res. 72. Granting the consent of the Congress to the Red River Boundary Compact.

H.R. 999. To amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4700. To grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact.

H.J. Res. 109. Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2647. To amend the Act entitled "An Act relating to the water rights of the Ak-Chin Indian Community" to clarify certain provisions concerning the leasing of such water rights, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.